UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/529,020 | 10/06/2005 | Yan Gao | NRC-6 | 8814 |
| Ira S Dorman | 7590 08/26/200 | | EXAMINER | |
| Suite 300 | - | | DOLLINGER, MICHAEL M | |
| 330 Roberts Street East Hartford, CT 06108 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1796 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/26/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/529,020 | GAO ET AL. | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | MIKE DOLLINGER | 1796 | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v | , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slaset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount on the content of the corresponding amount of the | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | te extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c | sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially rec orresponding number of finally reje | E below); lucing or simplifying th | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.114. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed the second of the second | See attached Notice of Non-Cor | | | | | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | be entered and an ex | xplanation of | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | /ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a | | | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | | • | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (label{eq:disclosure}). | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| /Randy Gulakowski/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796 | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants have amended the claims to limit the poly(phthalazinones) to consist essentially of unit of the formula I. Applicants also argue that since the SPPESK polymers of Dai et al are water soluble they cannot function as membranes in a PEM. However this raises new considerations of the prior art and of the instant application: Applicants claim a degree of sulfonation of up to 1.2 (in claim 15) but indicate in Table 5 of the disclosure that a poly(phthalazinone according to the amended claims with a degree of sulfonation of 1.2 is water soluble at 80 C. In summary, Applicants argue that the prior art polymers are inoperable in the intended use of the claimed invention because they are water soluble but embodiments of the claimed invention are also water soluble. Furthermore, Applicants test water solubility at 80 C but the arguments indicate that 90 C is a reasonable PEM-fuel cell operating temperature [see Applicants' arguments submitted 08/06/09 page 7 line 2]. It is unclear whether the claimed poly(phthalazinones) will be water soluble at the operating temperature of 90 C. The proposed amendments henceforth raise more issues that would require further consideration and do not place the present claims in condition for allowance .